

M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

Meeting: Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #14

Date: May 26, 2004

The fourteenth meeting of the Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force was held on May 26, 2004 in the Eastridge Mall Community Room at 7:00 PM.

Task Force Attendees: Councilmember Dave Cortese, Alan Covington (Charrette participant), Bill Kozlovsky (Quimby Creek), Chris Corpus (Charrette participant, KONA), Daniel Gould (Silver Creek Valley Country Club), Daniel Jacobs (Meadowlands), Garth Cummings (Charrette participant), Homing Yip (EHRAG), Ike White (Mt. Pleasant), Jenny Chang (EHRAG – alternate), Jose Arranda (Meadowfair – alternate), Khanh Nguyen (Charrette participant, West Evergreen SNI), Mike Alvarado (Charrette participant), Paul Pereira (Millbrook), Rick Caton (charrette participant), Scott Nickle, Sherry Gillmore (charrette participant, Holly Oak), Steve Moore (Evergreen Valley Church), Steve Tedesco (Charrette participant, Boys & Girls Club), Sylvia Alvarez (Charrette participant, EESD Board of Trustees), Tian Zhang (Madison Neighbors), Tom Andrade (Charrette participant, EESD Superintendent), Victor Klee, Vikki Lang (Evergreen Little League – alternate), Vince Soncayawon (EBPA, charrette participant)

Members of the Public: Tony Seebach, Katja Irvin, Traci Mason, Beck Mason, Marilyn Tanner, Susan Jones, Sal Alvarez, Tony Seebach, Richard Lambie, Marie Sinatra

Development Community: Joe Sordi, Mike Keaney, Mark Day, Bo Radanovich, Jeff McMullen, Bonnie Moss, Jessica Heinzelman, Gary Black, Tom Armstrong

Staff: Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sara Hensley (PRNS), Richard Keit (RDA), Kerynn Gianotti (D8), Britta Buys (PBCE), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Manuel Pineda (DOT), Rabia Chaudhry (D8)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Councilmember Cortese welcomed the group and dispensed with introductions in the interest of time. He did, however, ask people who were new to these meetings, to introduce themselves. He also explained that new groups interested in joining the task force at this point would not be permitted because so much has transpired over the course of the last ten months. He said that instead the task force could reach out to these groups individually during the June and July community engagement activities. He reiterated that task force members who joined EVP during the process carefully read over the Guiding Principles. This document is the basis for all decision-making and new members must agree to abide by this document or convince (by consensus) the other Task Force members to change it.

II. DISCUSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Bonnie Moss explained that what was being distributed is not the actual community engagement tool-kit but a preview of what it shall entail. Over the coming meetings, task force members can expect to receive iterations of these documents. She and Jessica Heinzelman proceeded to explain the individual pieces of the preview and asked members to pay special attention to the spreadsheet listing the target groups to which task force members agreed to reach out.

Task force member Sherry Gillmore asked that if she knows of a community meeting coming up and wants to invite staff for a presentation, how much time should be allotted for this. Moss said less than an hour but at least 20 minutes. Enough time needs to be allocated for two-way feedback. Heinzelman asked task force members to contact Rabia Chaudhry or Kerynn Gianotti if they would like to schedule meetings or coordinate presentations.

Task force member Mike Alvarado commented that he knew two or three people who, if this process could be presented to them, would generate useful feedback. Moss asked the task force to review the documents and give initial feedback.

III. CONCLUDE DISCUSSION ON INITIAL TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

Laurel Prevetti explained that many questions arose at the May 22, 2004 meeting and that the document being circulated reflected a draft of those questions and answers. She added that more questions came in after the Saturday meeting and those will be researched and answered and provided to the task force for the next meeting. She asked Manuel Pineda (DOT) and Gary Black (Hexagon Consultant) to do a brief recap of the 5/22 traffic presentation. Black explained that on 5/22 an initial traffic analysis on the impact of 7100 additional units (a number picked solely for running the analysis and not rooted in anything approved) on freeways, major interchanges, etc. The projected traffic simulation assumes a number of base improvements will be in place. The study concluded that commute hours in the a.m. would be roughly equivalent to what exists now and commute hours in the p.m. would improve significantly along highway 101. Pineda added that the analysis looked at multimode improvements (traffic calming, intelligent transportation systems, etc), which were broken down into tiers.

Gillmore asked if the simulation shown on 5/22 was available. Pineda responded that distilling the simulation to paper is difficult but DOT will put something together for distribution.

Task force member Jenny Chang asked how the wait time numbers were generated. Black said that the existing wait times were calculated by literally counting cars. To estimate the change based on the transportation improvement and the additional units, the numbers are derived from the current wait time. Cars were assigned average wait times. Chang said that the numbers seemed strange – too short. Black responded that these numbers are based on the worst hour in the morning and the evening.

Task force member Tian Zhang commented that it is important to take a close look at this study since decisions are being based on it. Alvarado asked if the actual data would be

given to the task force in the form of a few simple graphs. Black said this could be done and in some cases new counts and times could be recorded.

Task force member Alan Covington asked if the data is weighted. Black responded no.

Task force member Tom Andrade asked where the measurement of the Tully Road wait time occurs. Black said that all of these measurements occur at the beginning of the metering light.

Covington asked which trip per unit rate is used. Black said that national numbers are not used but those prepared for the City of San Jose. In any case, Hexagon can go out to do additional counts. Pineda asked the task force what else they would like (re) –examined.

Task force member Homing Yip said he would like the number of cars entering the highway to be recounted. Black that explained this count was done and then compared against the number of homes in Evergreen. Yip said he feels the numbers are very off. Black explained that what is being measured is how long it takes cars to get through the metering lights.

Task force member Sylvia Alvarez commented that many homes in Evergreen contain more than one family so the trips per household would be higher. Tian Zhang commented that there are in some areas in Evergreen, two homes per plot. Black responded that the study takes this into account because it's viewed as two separate units. Member of the public Sal Alvarez reiterated Sylvia Alvarez's comments regarding multifamily homes. This issue does not appear to be a part of the framework for discussion. Traffic lights aren't synchronized, lines to enter freeway grow longer. Pineda said that staff can redo counts. He asked the task force to keep in mind that literally each car is counted – there are no assumptions made. Alvarez responded that there a group of religious leaders in the Evergreen area who have approached State Assemblyman Simon Salinas, asking him not to support any new development in Evergreen until the issue of multifamily homes is resolved.

Task force member Garth Cummings commented that staff should obtain the number of registered vehicles in Evergreen. He also urged fellow task force members to time how long it takes them to get from the metering lights onto the highway since perception of wait time and reality of wait time may differ. Alvarado suggested a subcommittee of the task force work with transportation analysis staff to provide more feedback on this. He also asked if there were responses to questions that came in after 5/22. Pineda said that staff could only respond to a few between 5/22 and 5/26 and that the rest would be answered by the next task force meeting.

Task force member Paul Pereira asked the task force to consider that some people leave Evergreen because of a lack of amenities. Once some amenities are in place here, there may less of an outpour of residents. Black responded that this issue came up at the 5/22 meeting. Hexagon can re-run the numbers to show just the travel habits of new units. Also, they can plug more infrastructures into the analysis and see how the numbers change.

Covington commented that some of the proposed traffic improvements call for lane additions. Has Hexagon determined whether the roads can accommodate these expansions? Black said yes.

Gillmore commented that her husband uses side streets when leaving Evergreen and that likely a core percent of the population is doing this.

Task force member Lou Kvitek commented that perhaps the task force should consider regulating the number of families living in homes when looking to alleviate congestion. Cortese responded that there are constitutional issues at stake. The City has tried to use floor-area ratios to regulate but ultimately zoning laws cannot be extended to break up families. Kvitek asked if a gated community could accomplish this. Cortese said perhaps yes, and that someone from the City Attorney's Office can address this at the next meeting. Kvitek said that the gated community concept could be implemented on the campus industrial sites. Developers can help encourage this by limiting garage and curb space.

IV. DISCUSS COMMUNITY AMENITIES

Dave Mitchell explained that the City of San Jose Greenprint was created in 1999 to guide the city's development of green space and amenities over the next 20 years. The documents calls for an investment of over 675 million dollars, 47 of which for here in Evergreen. Mitchell proceeded with presenting a powerpoint on the [Greenprint vision for District 8](#) as well as an analysis of [the task force's amenities list](#), adding that the Evergreen Visioning Project might allow for the realization of some of the Greenprint's planned improvement to occur sooner. (NOTE: project costs contained in presentations do not account for price of land)

Task force member Rick Caton asked if the proposed trail system on the amenities list would connect with the county trails system. Mitchell said yes. Caton also asked about the fire station and whether or not it would come from amenities money. Prevetti said that there is bond money for this project and so hopefully we would not need to drain our amenities money.

Covington asked if the city could support the ongoing maintenance of the proposed projects (should they come on line). Mitchell said that staff is investigating this issue citywide. In the case of community centers, perhaps community-based organizations (CBO) could run them. Covington asked if park maintenance would also be covered by the City. Cortese urged the task force to not let District 8's capital projects be sacrificed by concerns of maintenance. The Greenprint is the city's plan for increased infrastructure and it is the city's responsibility to find the operation and maintenance funds necessary to run these projects.

Alvarado asked if a map where these proposed assets would go could be made available. Mitchell said that ultimately that will be presented and the task force will have a say in placement. Alvarado asked if different park layouts could be present that use lower maintenance elements. Mitchell said that it is being investigated. For example, schools and colleges use synthetic turf – this is less expensive than grass. Sara Hensley added it is a challenge to find new ways to do things at lower cost and lesser labor intense but that

PRNS is strongly considering this. Mitchell added that one reason why parks capital projects are so high is because the city demands that prevailing wage be paid.

Task force member Ike White commented that he felt much of the Greenprint's activities excluded the North Evergreen area. He asked the task force and staff to consider consolidating facilities and realize savings. He cited such a complex in Springfield, MO, that allows for many sports to be played in one setting. Mitchell responded that when the Greenprint is updated next year, staff will review the assets and possibilities for North Evergreen. With respect to sports complexes, he cited the two Measure P funded ones, Shady Oaks (6 soccer fields) and Singleton (softball fields).

Andrade asked how staff planned to achieve the desired 3.5 acres of green space per 1000 residents. Mitchell said that the city considers parks, schools and recreation elements as part of the 3.5. Andrade continued that Evergreen is in need of areas for organized sports. Currently school fields are being used and becoming worn. Cortese said the District 8 amenity list accounts for this. Prevetti added that the amenity list contains projects of varying categories. For example, the SNI projects have their own funding commitment from the Redevelopment Agency and the City. Cortese agreed, adding that the fire station is a bond project. The ice rink, although requiring a capital outlay, will be cost recovery.

Cortese reminded the group that although a 7000 unit count has been thrown out during the evening and the meeting before, it is not a number that has been agreed upon either by him or the task force. The task force needs to continue and finish the discussion on density and unit count. Gillmore expressed concern because she feels that EVP is already a done deal. She cited Cortese's comments to Assemblymember Simon Salinas in Sacramento on 5/24/04, where he stated that only some money is needed from the state for the Highway 101 improvements because EVP would yield money for the project. Cortese clarified what he said to Salinas. He said that he told Salinas about EVP and that it was an ongoing study. If the state looked at the total cost of the Highway 101 improvements, they would be unnerved by the high cost and not fund it all. Instead, Cortese asked them to consider the possibility of contributing a lower dollar amount since there is the potential for EVP money to come through.

Alvarado commented that the task force really needs to distill the Guiding Principles to each property. Zhang commented that she felt the Guiding Principles were contradictory. Cortese said that this matter would have to be taken up at a later date. He explained that the whole task force has worked on and agreed to the principles. If Zhang has any questions, she can feel free to contact the Council Office or City Staff.

V. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 9:10PM.